

GRAND JUROR IN RAID ON J. H.

JEROME GIVES AN INCIDENT OF METROPOLITAN INQUIRY.

On Cross-Examination He Sticks to His Opinion That Seabury's Proceeding in Jury Fixing Case Was a Cheap Political Play and Bid for Notoriety.

District Attorney Jerome charged in the recent committee proceedings before Commissioner Hand yesterday that a member of a recent Grand Jury attempted to lead a bear raid on Delaware and Hudson stock. Apparently Mr. Jerome referred to the January, 1908, Grand Jury, one of whose members presented a communication containing charges against the Delaware and Hudson management. The suggestion was made that the Metropolitan investigation was going on should be suspended while Delaware and Hudson witnesses were heard. This suggestion was not adopted, and the letter was referred to the District Attorney for a preliminary examination. Nothing came of it.

At the time when this took place at least one New York paper was raising a fuss over Delaware and Hudson, publishing "exclusive" accounts of the investigation which the Grand Jury was to make and the witnesses whom District Attorney Jerome had been directed to subpoena. One of the grand jurors was presumed to be supplying this information.

The Delaware and Hudson management began to assume the features of a storm center on January 30 of the present year, when complaint was made to the Public Service Board that they had paid dividends out of borrowed money. The Grand Jury "rumors" occurred on February 19, and about a week later a suit was begun in the Supreme Court to restrain the company from paying its quarterly dividends. Two months of a similar character were begun in the next three weeks. All the suits have come to naught, one of them having been dropped when a firm of Amsterdam bankers whose name had been used as a complainant repudiated the action. The application to the Public Service Commission for an investigation also has been denied.

Mr. Jerome mentioned the Delaware and Hudson incident in connection with the Amory charges against the Metropolitan which he contends were part of a bear raid on the traction stock.

"The same sort of a thing, and I think I say it advisedly," said Mr. Jerome, "was attempted by a grand juror in a raid on Delaware and Hudson. It is very trying when one has to be on the watch for such matters and check them up."

Mr. Jerome at yesterday's hearing finished his testimony in his own defense, and the cross-examination was taken up. Lawyer Franklin Pierce for the King committee brought out what he regarded as some very important points in reference to Mr. Jerome's conduct of the Metropolitan jury fixing charges.

He got Mr. Jerome to acknowledge that he had read, between March 9 and March 26, 1906, the deposition Louis E. Julian had made as a basis for the investigation which was to begin before Justice Seabury on the latter date. In that deposition Julian told of having overheard a conversation in the Metropolitan's law office between Ambrose J. McCabe on the one side and Stanley Bagge, Stanley Bagge, Jr., and Stanley Bagge, Sr., on the other. McCabe, according to the Julian affidavit, was objecting to having the Bagges pay a jury \$40. He thought \$25 was enough, but, according to Julian, McCabe finally gave in and signed a voucher for \$40.

Between March 9 and March 26, when, as Lawyer Pierce figured it, a search ought to have been made by the Metropolitan investigating officer for corroborative evidence, George R. Bagge was in the employ of the District Attorney's office as a special detective.

Herein, said Lawyer Pierce, "was a man who was named in Julian's deposition as being one of the principals in this conversation in the Metropolitan offices, why didn't you question him?"

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome, "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"You didn't ask me," replied Mr. Jerome. "I asked you to tell of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before," said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."

"But why haven't you told of this conversation between yourself and George R. Bagge, before?" said Mr. Jerome. "You said yesterday that you had told of this conversation to your brother Stanley, but you said nothing of this."



Buy It To-day
ELETO COMPANY N. Y.

evidence before him that the vouchers were destroyed and that Seabury had evidence in a Julian affidavit marked for identification by Mr. Jerome himself that many vouchers had been taken away by two investigators and were probably in existence.

"Do you still say," asked Mr. Pierce, "that this was the most indecent proceeding you ever saw?"

"I see no reason to alter my opinion," said the District Attorney. Then he added: "It seemed to me a miserable, cheap bid for notoriety by yellow journals and that when a judge would lend himself to it it was a pretty cheap thing. The whole thing was a bit of cheap claptrap. It was a cheap John performance, just as this one of yours is, Mr. Pierce."

"Well, are you through with your vituperation?"

"No, it would take me all day to tell you what I think of you."

Mr. Jerome continued that he had heard nothing of the Tillinghast jury fixing cases until January 27, 1906. The cases had been in his office, he said, since October 27, 1906. Mr. Jerome said the complaints were handled by his assistants and that not a word had been spoken to him about them.

The first he knew of them was when A. Edward Woodruff sent him a letter asking about Tillinghast's confession. It was, of course, been the contention of Lawyer Woodruff and the King committee that Mr. Jerome suppressed this evidence until Woodruff took it up before the Legislature.

Mr. Jerome said he could not personally have knowledge of all the thousands of cases that came into his office. Julian has testified that he carried his story to John A. Hennelery, Mr. Jerome's chief clerk, during Mr. Jerome's campaign in the fall of 1905.

Mr. Jerome said he trusted his assistants implicitly and that he had never yet been compelled to overrule them in an important case.

The cross-examination will go on to-day and then Mr. Jerome will call some witnesses in defense.

THE INQUIRY GOES ON.
Appellate Division Refuses to Enjoin the Proceeding.

The Appellate Division denied yesterday an application made by Wesley M. Oler, president of the American Ice Company, for an injunction restraining the special Grand Jury and the Attorney-General from going on with the ice investigation.

The witnesses examined yesterday were Henry C. Harrison, auditor of the American Ice Company, and Robert Scott, who was the secretary of the company. They were examined by the last Grand Jury, which refused to indict.

PINO GUERRA HERE ON A VISIT.
New Commander of the Cuban Army to Tour the Military Posts.

Gen. Pino Guerra, commander of the Cuban army, Major Mari, son of the Cuban patriot, José Martí, and Capt. Land, commander of the machine gun battery of the Cuban army, arrived yesterday from Havana aboard the Ward liner Havana. They will go to Washington and visit the War Department and later make a tour of the military posts of the country. Gen. Guerra spent two months at the officers' school at Fort Leavenworth. The three will attend the French and German army maneuvers and will return to Cuba in October and begin recruiting for the Cuban army. Gen. Guerra was in America once when he was a boy.

Other passengers by the Havana were Sir William Wilton, chairman of the board of directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; Col. Monteverde, Capt. Frank McCoy and A. Butt of the United States Army; Major Slocum, Mrs. K. Steinhardt, former American Consul-General at Havana, who brought the body of his mother, who died in Havana.

Mr. Jerome asked Mr. Vreeland if he felt that he was entitled to immunity for any testimony that he gave. He said: "I have no feeling of any crime having been committed by me, but under the statute for immunity for furnishing information I would like to say that I furnished over my personal signature all of the information that the Metropolitan Securities Company that the Public Service Commission got and I claim immunity under that statute."

"You furnished them a lot of information that they did not bring out, did you not?" Mr. Jerome asked.

"Yes, sir," said Mr. Vreeland. "Mr. Ryan was questioned about the sale of the DuPont and Corliss Street Ferryway franchise, in which he was a half owner with Anthony N. Brady. The price paid for the franchise was \$250,000, although on the books of the company it was put down as \$950,000. Mr. Ryan got only \$111,000."

By Mr. Jerome—Now, what induced you, this road having been sold without your knowledge or consent, to waive the \$350,000 profit? A. I suppose it did it in the common interest. Other people expected to be reimbursed or had been reimbursed. They were content to have them reimburse out of the profits derived from the sale of that road without any protest? A. Yes. We had been standing together on this property for a great many years.

Q. And you are getting at Mr. Ryan, if you were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

VREELAND CLAIMED IMMUNITY

TOLD PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ALL THAT GOT ABOUT MET

And More Than They Found Out in Evidence—Storage Battery Little Was Carried for Public Service Commission in November Grand Jury's Minutes.

The testimony taken before the November Grand Jury about the affairs of the Metropolitan Street Railway Company was made public yesterday on the new order of Judge Rosaksky, whose decision that Paul D. Cravath could not be made to testify about his relations with Thomas D. Ryan, stopped that investigation. Assistant District Attorney Snyth, representing Mr. Jerome, objected to Judge Rosaksky that the testimony should not be revealed to the public but should be sent to Commissioner Hand, who could make public what he thought was pertinent to the Jerome inquiry. Judge Rosaksky, however, made it all public.

One of the contentions of Franklin Pierce, who is conducting the Jerome prosecution, is that there was a radical difference in the testimony before the November Grand Jury and the testimony before the January Grand Jury. Those who examined the two records could not find any essential conflict in the testimony. It appears that Mr. Jerome was more severe in his examination of Mr. Ryan before the first Grand Jury.

The testimony of Herbert H. Vreeland shows that he considered himself immune from prosecution (although not guilty) because he had supplied the Public Service Commission with all the information he had about the Metropolitan. William M. Ivins has said that Mr. Vreeland was not called as a witness before the Public Service Commission because there was no desire to give him immunity.

Mr. Vreeland told the Grand Jury that the \$250,000 that was paid for Electric Storage Battery stock, 3,500 shares of which were sent to Huhn & Co. of Philadelphia at the time the \$500,000 was turned over to William C. Whitney by Messrs. Ryan, Dolan, Widener, Elkins and Whitney, was for "political purposes."

By Mr. Jerome—Did Mr. Whitney tell you that these Storage Battery transactions were not real transactions? A. He told me they were transactions that he was carrying for political purposes.

Q. Well, did he get the stock? A. The company got the stock.

Q. And it remained a part of the assets? A. It did.

Q. What did they do with it? A. It was turned over to Mr. Whitney.

Q. Did Mr. Whitney pay for it? A. No, sir. It was sold and used to straighten up an account with money that were paid in.

"You mean," Mr. Jerome said, "that during the years you were associated with Mr. Whitney he was in the habit of carrying stocks for persons prominent in political life and if there were profits the people prominent in political life got them and if there were losses Mr. Whitney stood them?"

"Yes, sir," Mr. Vreeland replied. "Now," Mr. Jerome said, "what gave you the idea that he was carrying it for some individual or individuals prominent in political life?"

"He said he was carrying it for people interested in politics and for the interest of the company."

Mr. Vreeland did not know that Mr. Whitney carried any stock for Richard Croker or Charles F. Murphy. He said he had no idea as to who the persons were carrying the stocks. He admitted he had no authority from the directorate of the Metropolitan for making the payments to Mr. Whitney and that he simply exercised his power as president of the Metropolitan.

Mr. Jerome asked Mr. Vreeland if he felt that he was entitled to immunity for any testimony that he gave. He said: "I have no feeling of any crime having been committed by me, but under the statute for immunity for furnishing information I would like to say that I furnished over my personal signature all of the information that the Metropolitan Securities Company that the Public Service Commission got and I claim immunity under that statute."

"You furnished them a lot of information that they did not bring out, did you not?" Mr. Jerome asked.

"Yes, sir," said Mr. Vreeland. "Mr. Ryan was questioned about the sale of the DuPont and Corliss Street Ferryway franchise, in which he was a half owner with Anthony N. Brady. The price paid for the franchise was \$250,000, although on the books of the company it was put down as \$950,000. Mr. Ryan got only \$111,000."

By Mr. Jerome—Now, what induced you, this road having been sold without your knowledge or consent, to waive the \$350,000 profit? A. I suppose it did it in the common interest. Other people expected to be reimbursed or had been reimbursed. They were content to have them reimburse out of the profits derived from the sale of that road without any protest? A. Yes. We had been standing together on this property for a great many years.

Q. And you are getting at Mr. Ryan, if you were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

Q. You were willing to let the Metropolitan system to waive the very large profits that might have come to you, why didn't you do that and let the company have it at what it cost you? A. I had nothing to do with the arrangements. I was not in the company.

MANUEL PROCLAIMED KING.

Took the Customary Oath Before the House of the Cortes.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
LISBON, May 6.—With the customary ceremony King Manuel took the oath to-day to support the Constitution and was formally proclaimed sovereign of Portugal and the Portuguese possessions.

The route from the palace to the Parliament building, a distance of two miles, was guarded by soldiers. The King, wearing the royal regalia and a crimson velvet mantle lined with ermine, drove from the palace, escorted by a large detachment of cavalry.

There was a great gathering of titled and notable personages, diplomats and other dignitaries in the Chamber of Deputies, where the throne was placed. The crown, scepter and other royal insignia, a crucifix and a misal were held on a credence alongside the throne. The peers and deputies met the King at the entrance of the House and marched in procession to the throne, where, holding the misal in his right hand and the scepter in his left, the boy king pronounced the oath, as follows:

"I swear to maintain the Apostolic Roman Catholic religion and the integrity of the kingdom. I swear to observe and cause to be observed the political constitution of the Portuguese nation and the other laws of the kingdom and to care for the general welfare of the nation so far as it is in my power."

There was no coronation. Indeed, the sovereign of Portugal never dons the crown, which is consecrated in the treasury. After taking the oath the King addressed the brilliant assembly. The President of the House of Peers responded. Then heralds proclaimed: "The most high, most powerful and very faithful King" the whole assembly shouting in chorus.

The heralds and other officials then went on a balcony of the building and proclaimed the King to the crowd outside.

The loyalists shouted in response the traditional words of homage and the warships in the River Tagus fired salutes. As the King returned to the Necessidades Palace in procession there was much enthusiasm among the aristocratic onlookers, and women threw flowers from the balconies.

PARIS CHARITY ART SALE.
High Prices for Examples of Delacroix, Corot and Fantin de La Tour.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
PARIS, May 6.—The sale of the Chéramy art collection was continued to-day, 122 pictures being disposed of for a total of \$76,478. Thirty-six of the works were by Delacroix, and the total price realized for them was \$47,942. One brought \$6,500, the highest figure obtained for any single example of the thirty-six offered.

Eighteen Corots were disposed of. The highest price for one of these was \$2,200. Seven examples of the work of Fantin de La Tour brought \$2,463, of which sum \$760 was the top price for a single painting.

TELEPHONE RIVALRY IN CUBA.
Gov. Magoun to Refer Proposed New Law to Washington.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
HAVANA, May 6.—The Advisory Commission has adopted a new telephone law, which has been a long pending local question, opening the telephone business to competition, which, it is understood, is satisfactory to the users of telephones.

Gov. Magoun will refer the law to Washington. The telephone dispute was one of the reasons for Mr. Magoun's recent trip to the United States.

CHURCHILL BACK IN DUNDEE.
Negotiations for Settlement of Shipyard Strike Postponed.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, May 6.—The negotiations between the shipyard owners and their locked-out employees, which are being presided over by Winston Churchill, President of the Board of Trade, have been without result thus far, but the fact that they were today postponed until May 11 is interpreted hopefully.

Mr. Churchill has returned to Dundee to continue his electoral campaign in that constituency.

PORTO RICO QUARANTINE.
Gov. Post Wants News of Venezuela No as to Bar Out the Plague.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
SAN JUAN, P. R., May 6.—Gov. Post, who is now in Washington, has called to the Insular Board of Health, asking that full information concerning the outbreak of plague in Venezuela be sent him in order that the disease entering Porto Rico.

SPANIARD GETS HOPE DIAMOND.
Senor Habib, Not the Sultan, the Buyer.

Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, May 7.—The Express says on the authority of its Paris correspondent that the purchaser of the Hope blue diamond was not the Sultan of Turkey, as was stated, but a wealthy Spaniard, Senor Habib, who is a collector of rare jewels and who has an office in Paris.

Vase Sold for \$11,550.
Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, May 6.—A vase thirteen and a half inches high, designed by Duplessis, with handles formed as elephants' heads, was sold to-day at Christie's auction of the Conyngham collection for \$11,550. A similar but larger vase brought half that price.

New Gallery for Display of Turners.
Special Cable Dispatch to THE SUN.
LONDON, May 6.—The senior member of the firm of Duveen Bros., the art dealers, will present a new wing to the Tate Gallery, in which the larger part of the Turner collection will be shown.

ATTACK ON LAWSON'S MINES.
Canadian Journal Says Legal Formalities Were Neglected in Yukon Claims.

OTTAWA, Ont., May 6.—Canadian papers intimate to-night the possibility of litigation regarding the sale of Yukon Gold claims. The Montreal Star has the following:

"Civil proceedings are to be instituted in Canada against Thomas W. Lawson for failing to comply with the requirements of the Ontario companies act in his Yukon Gold flotation. The Canadian Mining Journal is laying the information."

PASTOR WHO HEALS THE SICK

PRESBYTERIAN DIVINE DOES IT BY 'CHRISTIAN SUGGESTION.'

Rev. Dr. Campbell of Westminster Church, Brooklyn, Takes Cases and His Lord's Watch Helps With Prayer—Sends Organic Diseases to the Regular Doctors.

The Rev. Dr. Frederick Campbell, pastor of Westminster Presbyterian Church at Clinton street and First place, Brooklyn, stood last night before the members of his church who had assembled at the Wednesday night prayer meeting in the parlors of the church and told them of the progress of the "cases" he had been treating through the week with his Christian mental healing work. He called off the cases from a schedule he had in his hand, the monthly schedule of cases for the prayers of the Lord's Watch, his body of listeners.</